ANSWER TO COMPLAINT (DEMAND FOR JURY)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendants lack sufficient information and belief upon which to admit or deny the allegations contained therein and on that basis, deny. III. ANSWERING PARAGRAPHS 3, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, and 56, these answering defendants deny the allegations contained therein. AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND DISTINCT FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE COMPLAINT, these answering defendants allege that any alleged infringement, if at all, was done by mistake or inadvertence. AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these answering Defendants state that they have never knowingly installed any infringing program on any computer sold to the general public. AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these answering Defendants have never knowingly infringed upon Microsoft Corporation's patents or licenses. AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these answering Defendants allege that they have not knowingly engaged in unfair competition. AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these answering Defendants allege that all acts of any defendant were without knowledge and thus not willful or intentional and thus not subject to enhanced damages.

AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these answering Defendants allege that all installations of Microsoft products were done pursuant to licenses obtained from plaintiffs' authorized distributors.

1 AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these 2 answering Defendants allege that the complaint on file fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. 3 4 AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these 5 answering Defendants allege that the technology and material use in 6 the products marketed by these answering defendants are within the 7 public domain, and are not sufficiently unique so as to be subject 8 to protection by patent or trademark. 9 AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these 10 answering Defendants allege that any infringement or delusion was inadvertent and innocent. 11 12 AS AND FOR A SEPARATE AND TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, these 13 answering Defendants reserve the right to allege any additional 14 affirmative defenses not presently known or realized. 15 WHEREFORE, these answering Defendants pray for judgment as 16 follows: 17 1. That plaintiff take nothing by way of its action; That Defendants be awarded reasonable cost of suit 2. 18 19 incurred herein; 20 3. That Defendants be awarded attorney fees in defending 21 this action and; 22 For such other and further relief as this court may deem 4. 23 just and proper. 24 Dated: July 21, 2008 SHIFFLET, KANE & KONOSKE, LLP 25 By: /s/ Gregory P. Konoske 26 Gregory P. Konoske, Esq. Attorney for Defendants, 2.7 ARP COMPUTER SOLUTIONS, INC. and SALAH SOLTANI 28 gkonoske@shiffletlaw.com 08-CV-1026-WOH-JMA SF12645K

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT (DEMAND FOR JURY)

C	ase 3:08-cv-01026-WQH-JMA
1	DEMAND FOR JURY
2	Pursuant to FRCP 38(b) and L.R. 38.1, these answering
3	Defendants demand Trial by Jury on those issues to which there is
4	a legal right to Trial by Jury.
5	Dated: July 21, 2008 SHIFFLET, KANE & KONOSKE, LLP
6	
7	By: <u>/s/ Gregory P. Konoske</u> Gregory P. Konoske, Esq.
8	Attorney for Defendants, ARP COMPUTER SOLUTIONS, INC. and
9	SALAH SOLTANI gkonoske@shiffletlaw.com
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2425	
26	
27	
28	

	MICROSOFT CORPORATION v. ARP COMPUTER SOLUTIONS, INC., ET AL. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
2	Case No.: 08-CV-1026-WQH-JMA			
3	PROOF OF SERVICE			
4	I, GR	REGORY P. KONOSKE, declare as follows:		
5	entitled action. I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California, within which county and state the subject mailing occurred. My business address is 16880 West Bernardo Drive, Suite			
6				
7				
8	On July 21, 2008, I served the following document(s) described as: ANSWER TO COMPLAINT (DEMAND FOR JURY) on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof as follows:			
10		M. Mori, Esq. Attorney for Plaintiff,		
11	Katherine M. Dugdale, Esq. MICROSOFT CORPORATION Jennifer N. Chiarelli, Esq. Tel: (310) 788-9900 PERKINS COIE, LLP Fax: (310) 788-3399 12 1620 26 th Street, Sixth Floor South Tower			
12				
13				
14	[]	BY MAIL. I am readily familiar with the business practices at my place		
15		of business for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service and the correspondence shall be deposited with the United State Postal Service this same day in the ordinary course of business pursuant Code of Civil Procedure §1013(a).		
16				
17	[]	BY PERSONAL DELIVERY. I caused each envelope to be hand delivered to		
18		the each addressee leaving said envelope with either the addressee directly or another person at that address authorized to accept service on the		
19	r 1	addressee's behalf.		
20	L J	BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION. The counsel or interested party authorized to accept service, by whose name an asterisk (*) is placed, was		
21		also forwarded a copy of said document(s) by facsimile transmission at the telefax number corresponding with his name and address on the attached		
22		service list.		
23	[X]	BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE VIA CM/ECF SYSTEM. In accordance with the electronic filing procedures of this Court, service has been effected on		
24		the aforesaid party(ies) above, whose counsel of record is a registered participant of CM/ECF, via electronic service through the CM/ECF System.		
25		clare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of		
26	California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on the 21st day of July at San Diego, California.			
27		/s/ Gregory P. Konoske		
28	GREGORY P. KONOSKE			
	SF126	45K 5 08-CV-1026-WQH-JMA		

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT (DEMAND FOR JURY)